

**Planning Commission Meeting
Trail Conference Rooms
Gresham City Hall
April 26, 2010 6:30 p.m.**

I. Opening/Citizen Comments

A regular session of the Gresham Planning Commission was called to order by Vice-Chair Bailey on the 26th of April, 2010 at 6:35 p.m. in the Trail Conference Rooms at Gresham City Hall, located at 1333 NW Eastman Parkway, Gresham Oregon. The meeting was transcribed by Tammy Richardson.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Richard Anderson
Bill Bailey
Joy Gannett
Clint Holly
Lori Stegmann
Ken Stine

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Abbaté, Urban Design & Planning
Katherine Kelly, Environmental Services Transportation
Brian Martin, Urban Design & Planning

COUNCIL LIAISONS PRESENT: Councilor Craddick

Jim Craft addressed the Commission in regards to property between Telford Road and Highway 26 in Springwater. He feels it should be zoned for residential instead of industrial lands. His reasoning for this is that there is proposed residential to the west with homes that will have a Mt. Hood view. Mr. Craft feels these homes will not be desirable if they are looking over industrial development. He provided a map of the Springwater Plan District to the Commission.

Councilor Craddick reported to the Commission on the direction Council is going on appointments for the Planning Commission vacancies. She said they are working on it and hopes she will be able to report progress at the next meeting. She also noted that the Council discussed the Retail Development/Large Format (Big Box) Retail last week which generated a lively discussion and feels the City is making progress on this project. Mr. Abbaté stated that Council asked staff to accelerate the project a little bit and the schedule is being moved forward about six weeks in order to have the enactment reading on the project by the end of the year.

The Commission briefly discussed the industrial and residential lands in Springwater subject of the comments provided earlier by Mr. Craft. Mr. Abbaté said he welcomes the Commission's ideas and comments on this issue. Commissioner Gannett stated that it warrants being looked at by staff to determine if there may be alternate locations or options that might be preferable. Mr. Abbaté responded that it will be looked into and a response will be made to Mr. Craft and the Commission.

II. Commission Business / Work Session Items

Downtown Parking Plan & Strategy

Brian Martin and Katherine Kelly presented the Downtown Parking report. Mr. Martin said the focus tonight is on the outcomes, which in this case is the vision for a more active, vital Downtown developed with the community over the past couple of years. Additionally, there is a need to accommodate today's parking needs as the project moves forward. The purpose of the project is to support city goals and policies, set parking requirements to achieve desired urban form, enhance parking management when supply does not meet demand, ensure parking requirements and parking management support each other, ensure adequate parking in the near and long-term, and identify potential funding sources. Mr. Martin identified the primary issues:

- Public parking supply and demand
- Minimum parking requirements affect urban form
- Maximum parking requirements affect urban form
- Funding

Katherine Kelly provided details on the public parking issues and outcome of the focus group discussions. There was some discussion on wayfinding signage and concerns about parking signs being placed in the right place. In addition to way finding signage, other element of the public parking issue include:

- Parking for special events
- Who parks where and when
- Underutilized parking
- Parking enforcement
- Performance measures – public parking lots

Commissioner Stine asked if there will be more charging stations for electric cars. Ms. Kelly said the City is part of a statewide and regional effort to look at where those stations might be located. Staff noted that part of the grant for this project is actually funding to install the charging stations in Gresham.

Brian Martin discussed the Minimum and Maximum parking requirement issues. Also described were the Possible Approaches and hypothetical examples of each possible scenario; how we might choose to move forward with regards to the Downtown parking:

- No change
- Lower maximum parking requirements and some additional management
- Update private parking requirements and enhance management
- Update private parking requirements and comprehensive management

Mr. Martin also provided information on public input to date. The public discussions and input resulted in the thought that Approach D is desirable but may be premature. Approach C was preferred in the interim and that maybe a fee in lieu could be added at least for residential. Overall, public input showed that flexibility and options for developers was favored; the Plan should enhance Downtown developments' financial feasibility; and that public parking facilities must be strategically located. Mr. Martin also identified the next steps which would be to evaluate the alternatives, select a preferred alternative and project implementation for both private and public parking.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Holly commented about the future potential of establishing parking districts and asked if the Code would allow a transfer of space to a parking structure. Is there a method to shift minimum and maximum square footage requirements down to accommodate a public structure. Mr. Martin said that in regards to a 40,000 square foot lot it would be assumed that a subset of that square footage is their minimum parking requirement and likely would have exceeded the minimum to get that. At this time, the Code would require they keep that minimum and would be able to develop the rest of it. Under the Code right now, the minimum required parking must be met. He said if a method is set up to allow developers to get access down the road it could be worked out with a new development. Commissioner Holly suggested that be looked at. Mr. Martin said one of the risks you take with private lots is they are memorialized forever. May want to find a way to make sure that can be redeveloped in the future and still have adequate parking.

The Commission also discussed on parking lots versus parking structures/garages. Some examples were given. Commissioner Holly said maybe one solution would be to take those in DCC, DTM and DMU and make a permitted use for parking structures, with perhaps a requirement for retail space on the ground floor. Commissioner Bailey said that would encourage private development to take over a large piece of the parking management strategy. Commissioner Anderson said that he has worked on parking issues (outside of Gresham) for the past month and that sometimes demand exceeds 4 spaces per 1,000 square feet. He said that transit connection doesn't seem to make a difference.

Mr. Martin said the key thing is if we allow development coming in at 4 or 5 per thousand square feet, we can make a decision that is what we want but we are not going to get the desired urban form. Mr. Abbaté asked about allowing parking at 4.5 per thousand, but the maximum footprint for parking would be limited to 40,000 square feet. Commissioner Anderson stated that he feels that could work. Commissioner Bailey said some of the observations he had during previous presentations on this issue is really coming to grips with the 40,000 square feet balanced with the stalls per thousand. A good part of that is if it is going to be a surface lot maybe we should talk about a lower ratio, but if it is structured parking give them a higher ratio. Structured parking needs to be promoted. Commissioner Bailey said he thinks there is a way to balance and manipulate if we want structured parking to give them a bonus for doing structured because they have to pay more to do it.

Commissioner Bailey said he is a little concerned about the entitlements part. Essentially it is the City getting into the parking rental business, or parking mandate business. It gets back to enforcement, management and staff time. It also gets to the point where if the City has broader goals you might have a piece of property that is entitled and there is a contractual obligation to provide parking within a certain radius of a certain business. What if it becomes the best interest of the City to redevelop that parcel as

something else? Do you have to acquire another parcel within that radius? Commissioner Bailey feels it is a good tool for developers, but entitlements do have a lot of complexity that we need to be aware of.

Commissioner Bailey said in response to the earlier discussion on private development of parking structures, he thinks we should find a way to promote and allow it. He also said that in regard to in lieu of providing minimum parking there be a fee (Option C), he thinks we need to be careful around Station area development because we are trying to promote lower parking ratios, especially residential, in certain Station areas. He doesn't know that a fee for going lower is the right thing to do. The City needs to bolster and support those station areas. Mr. Martin said one of the key components is how it is priced. If you price the fee at more than the developer would pay to create the space that isn't an incentive. If priced lower then it may still be an incentive. Commissioner Bailey said a lot of what is being discussed here is the City is going to have to start getting into a parking inventory and begin to keep track of which parcels have how many stalls -- in other words parking management. More than just meters, time stalls and enforcement.

Mr. Martin said that one of the things staff heard from public input is that people want the City to pay attention to 1) how the vacant commercial spaces may affect parking lots in the future; and 2) if we change the management of the public spaces, how does that affect private lots?

Mr. Martin asked if the Commission feels this is a desirable tool to have in place when opportunities arise. Commissioner Anderson responded that he thinks it is, but it would have to be a longer term and not a month-by-month type of thing.

A summary of discussion points included:

- Parking structures as permitted uses?
- Tool to allow people to exceed the maximum-- nice to have but complicated
- Fee in lieu -- don't want to have it structured to discourage development
- Maximum ratios -- some uses may desire more parking than maximum
- Adjust ratios? minimum and maximum

Other comments:

- There is a parking survey on the web site that 170 persons have taken
- Different responses from parking users than Downtown business owners with regards to how far customers will walk to destinations after they park
- Electric vehicle charging stations needed
- If minimum parking is too low it will choke up the neighborhoods
- Parking management may be required in low density residential areas
- Reviewed elements of the four Approach options again
- Parking ratios need to be adequate to make development projects feasible
- Near transit may not need as many parking spaces
- "Permit" parking; shared use reduces parking spaces
- Good Code Compliance response in Downtown for enforcement of "abandoned" cars
- Private parking on private lots, or manage on-street parking/overflow? Policy choices
- Auto "storage" on streets vs. parking usage could be problem
- Use signage for no parking during certain hours

Mr. Martin noted that the next step will be to develop the preferred approach, more outreach to the community and then staff will come back to the Planning Commission before presenting the preferred alternative to Council.

III. Other Business / Adjournment

Commissioner Stine provided liaison reports on the CDHS and Historic subcommittees. He said there wasn't much to report on the Historic Resources Subcommittee as they do not meet very often. A detailed summary of the March 25th CDHS meeting is attached as part of his report.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:35 p.m.

Chair

Recording Secretary

Date

Date

Note: For more detailed information, an audio recording of the meeting can be accessed by visiting:
<http://www.greshamoregon.gov/city/city-departments/mayor-and-city-council/council-advisory-committees/Planning-Commission.aspx>.